Application No. 10/612,429
Reply to Office Action dated: September 10, 2008
Reply dated: December 10, 2008

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed September 10, 2008 and an interview with Examiner George Monikang on November 6, 2008. Applicant acknowledges the courtesy of an interview with the Examiner, during the course of which interview several amendments to the claims were discussed, the substance of which amendments are set forth fully herein.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action dated September 10, 2008, Claims 1, 5-7, 14, 17-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui (U.S. Patent Number No. 7,237,254). Claims 8 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui, in view of Frederick (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,424). Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui, in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,498 B2, hereafter Takahashi) and further in view of Rui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2, hereafter Rui).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19-21, and 23, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 5-9, 14, and 17-24. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated September 10, 2008, Claims 1, 5-7, 14, 17-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui (U.S. Patent Number No. 7,237,254). Claims 8 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui, in view of Frederick (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,424). Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omoigui, in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,498 B2) and further in view of Rui (U.S. Patent No. 7,349,005 B2).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

 (Currently Amended) A method for managing audio devices located at a live event during the live event, comprising:

capturing video content of the live event at a first location, wherein different areas of the video content are associated with a plurality of the audio devices located at the first location, the audio devices capturing audio in the live event:

providing the video content of the live event captured at the first location to a user at a second location during the live event wherein the user views the video content in a graphical user interface (GUI);

receiving a selection of a first region of the video content, the selection made by a user during the live event using the GUI;

selecting the audio device at the first location associated with the at least one area within the first region of the video content; and

providing live audio from the selected audio device at the first location to the user at the second location.

Claim 1, as amended, defines a method for managing audio devices located at a live event during the live event. The method comprises capturing video content of the live event at a first location, wherein different areas of the video content are associated with a plurality of the audio devices located at the first location, the audio devices capturing audio in the live event; providing the video content of the live event captured at the first location to a user at a second location during the live event wherein the user views the video content in a graphical user interface (GUI); receiving a selection of a first region of the video content, the selection made by a user during the live event using the GUI; selecting the audio device at the first location associated with the at least one area within the first region of the video content; and providing live audio from the selected audio device at the first location to the user at the second location.

Omigui discloses that the widespread availability of streaming multimedia enables a variety of informational content that was not previously available over the Internet or other computer networks. Live content is one significant example of such content. Using streaming multimedia, audio, video, or audio/visual coverage of noteworthy events can be broadcast over the Internet as the events unfold. Similarly, television and radio stations can transmit their live content over the Internet. (Column 1, lines 40-48).

Omigui appears to only disclose that multimedia can be streamed over the Internet. In Claim 1, however, a selection of a first region of the video content is received, the selection made by a user during the live event using the GUI; and live audio from the selected audio device at the

Application No. 10/612,429 Reply to Office Action dated: September 10, 2008

Reply dated: December 10, 2008

first location is provided to the user at the second location. Thus, the user can tailor coverage of the live event to suit his or her needs by selecting regions of the video that are associated with specific audio devices. Additionally, the user can make the selection using a GUI, simplifying what would otherwise be a complex audio management task. Applicant respectfully submits that Omigui discloses streaming multimedia generally, and does not disclose or render obvious the features of Claim 1. as amended.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 23

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 14 and 23 have been amended similarly to Claim 1. For similar reasons as provided above for Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14 and 23 are similarly neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-9, 17-22, and 24

Claims 5-9, 17-22, and 24 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required. Application No. 10/612,429 Reply to Office Action dated: September 10, 2008 Reply dated: December 10, 2008

Resp	ectivity submitted,	
By:	/Nathan L. Feld/	

Nathan L. Feld Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14th Floor San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: (415) 362-3800

Date: December 10, 2008